DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 375 CS 011 847

AUTHOR Lore, Rosemary; Chamberlain, Edward
TITLE Language Development Component Chapter 1 Reading Program, 1992-93. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 94
NOTE 59p.; For 1991-92 report, see ED 358 439.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Early Intervention; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *Instructional Effectiveness; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; Low Achievement; Middle Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Middle School Students; Outcome Based Education

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the effectiveness of the Chapter 1 Reading Program, which provided assistance to 5,956 selected underachieving pupils in grades one through eight in the Columbus, Ohio public schools. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs for the improvement of language and reading skills. Data included results of norm-referenced tests administered in a spring-to-spring cycle. Results indicated that: (1) of the 1,896 grade 2-8 pupils in an evaluation sample, 58.6% gained 3.0 or more NCE points on the reading comprehension score; (2) total reading scores for a sample of 1,871 pupils in grades 2-8 increased an average of 4.9 NCE points; (3) of 1,909 first-grade and second-grade pupils, 1,557 (81.6%) read five books at or above text reading level 8 appropriate for promotion to the next grade; (4) of 1,896 pupils, 92.6% were promoted to the next grade or passed their target reading courses; and (5) 5,779 parents of pupils served were involved in one or more parent involvement activities, and that 77.4% of pupils served had one or more parents who were involved. Findings suggest the program should be continued; reasons for the small sample size should be determined and ameliorated if possible; the strong support system should continue; and planning should take place at the building level. (Contains 9 references and 11 tables of data are included; 2 tables of data and evaluation instruments are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 375

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM

1992-93

Written by:

Rosemary Lore and Edward Chamberlain,
Professional Specialists

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Data Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Thompson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS011847

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM
1992-93

Abstract

Program Description: The Chapter 1 Reading Program served 5956 pupils. Funding of the component was made available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1 of Title I of 1965, reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendment of 1988.

The purpose of the Chapter 1 Reading Program was to provide assistance to selected underachieving pupils in grades 1 through 8 in order that they might attain more fully their potential by improving their language and reading skills. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs, as determined by continued cooperation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Inservice sessions were provided for various subgroups of program teachers.

The program provided service to 85 public elementary schools, 28 public middle schools, and 12 nonpublic schools. One elementary school's program service (included in count above) was funded by the school system's general fund, but Chapter 1 guidelines were followed in all teaching units. Because public school program teachers were funded 90% by Chapter 1 funds and 10% by the school district's general fund, they were called Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers. Several different service patterns were devised in order to schedule Chapter 1 instruction for 90% of the teacher's time. Program teachers in the nonpublic schools served as full-time Chapter 1 teachers.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the program started on September 21, 1992, for all grades. For evaluation based on standardized test data the time interval ended March 26, 1993. This provided a maximum of 118 days for grades 1-8. An additional 25 school days (through May 7, 1993) were included in the time interval for evaluating Desired Outcomes not based on standardized test data. Each Desired Outcome had a pupil attendance criterion of attending 80% of scheduled program days for inclusion in the sample or treatment group.

Activities: Program teachers provided small group instruction to strengthen reading skills. Consultation with classroom teachers and parents was emphasized in order to provide for individual pupil needs.

Desired Outcomes: Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50% of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample--those who met the attendance criterion or were discontinued, were English-speaking, and had a valid pretest-posttest score for Reading Comprehension (advanced)--would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period. Desired Outcome 2 stated that at least 75% of pupils who met the treatment group attendance criterion would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their regular reading courses (grades 6-8). Desired Outcome 3 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in grade 1 would read at least five books at level 8 or above as certified by Chapter 1 teacher, and that at least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 2 and above in the treatment group who were not discontinued would independently read a minimum of ten books selected by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Evaluation Design: The Evaluation Design included the Desired Outcomes stated above and the instruments used to measure them. Desired Outcome 1 was evaluated through the administration of norm-referenced tests in a spring-to-spring testing cycle. The *Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6)*, were used for grades 1 and 2. Grades 3-8 received the *California Achievement Tests* (CAT, 1985) in the spring of 1992 and in the spring of 1993. Analyses of the pretest to posttest data were primarily in

terms of NCE change scores, using two different types of presentation: (1) the percentages of pupils by grade who had a change score in Reading Comprehension of at least 3.0 NCEs, which was the criterion for Desired Outcome 1, and (2) aggregate NCE change scores, which were compared with Federal and State Guidelines. Federal and State Guidelines require an aggregate gain of at least 1.0 NCE in both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading at the building level. Desired Outcomes 2 and 3 were evaluated by means of locally constructed instruments and/or the district computer files. Although not part of the evaluation design, parent involvement information was also collected by program teachers.

Major Findings: The information collected on the Pupil Data Sheets indicated the program served 5956 public and nonpublic pupils for an average of 3.4 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 4653.35 pupils. The average days of enrollment (days scheduled) per pupil was 103.4 days and the average attendance (days served) per pupil was 85.4 days.

Desired Outcome 1, that at least 50 percent of pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample gain 3.0 or more NCE points on the Reading Comprehension score (advanced skills), was attained. Of the 1896 pupils in the sample, 58.6% (1111 pupils) made the requisite gain. The average gain for Reading Comprehension across grades was 6.3 NCE points. At the individual grade level, all grades except grade 3, grade 6, and grade 8 met the criterion of 50 percent of pupils gaining 3.0 or more NCE points.

Additional analyses of aggregate achievement scores for Total Reading (basic skills) for grades 2-8 showed that for the evaluation sample of 1871 pupils the average gain score across grades was 4.9 NCE points. Positive changes ranged from 8.2 NCEs in grade 5 to 1.2 NCEs in grade 6.

Desired Outcome 2 was that at least 75 percent of pupils meeting the treatment group attendance criterion would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their regular reading courses (grades 6-8). This Desired Outcome was met at every grade level. Of the 1896 pupils in this treatment group 92.6% (1755 pupils) were promoted or passed their target courses.

Desired Outcome 3 stated that at least 50 percent of grade 1 treatment group pupils would read five books at or above text reading level 8 as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher and that at least 50 percent of grade 2 and above treatment group pupils, who were not discontinued, would independently read a minimum of ten books selected by the Chapter 1 teacher. This Desired Outcome was met at every grade. Of the 1909 pupils in the treatment group, 1557 (81.6%) of the pupils read the requisite number of books for their grade.

Parent involvement data indicated that an unduplicated count of 5779 parents of pupils served were involved in one or more parent involvement activities, and that 77.4% of pupils served had one or more parents who were involved.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor the record-keeping procedures of teachers. Telephone conferences, on-site visitation, and inspections of records were instrumental in assuring accuracy.

Recommendations: The following recommendations were made: (1) the program should be continued; (2) since only 1941 pupils of the 5956 program pupils served in grades 1-8 were included in the treatment group, ways to improve attendance should be studied; (3) continue the strong support system provided by program administrators and coordinators; (4) Department of Program Evaluation should continue monitoring of record keeping and data collection; and (5) plan at the building level to insure time for joint planning between program and classroom teachers.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM

1992-93

Program Description

The Chapter 1 Reading Program served 5956 pupils. Funding of the component was made available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1 of Title I of 1965, reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988.

The primary goal of the ESEA Chapter 1 Reading Programs was to help public and nonpublic students to become successful readers and learners at their grade levels *(Policy Guide and Handbook for ESEA Chapter 1 Programs*, 1992: Compiled by the Department of Competency Based Education, Federal and State Programs). This goal was two-pronged. The goal was to be accomplished by program teachers who were to provide two major services; supplementary instruction to selected students experiencing difficulty in reading and writing in their regular classroom setting and opportunities for parent involvement through conferences, group meetings, classroom visits and progress reports.

The first target of the goal, provide supplementary instruction, stated that the supplementary instruction was to support the classroom instruction and to focus on the individual needs of public and nonpublic students who were identified for service. Nonpublic pupils in nonpublic schools, which qualified for Chapter 1 service, received instruction in mobile classroom units which travelled to the school sites. Specific support was provided to both public and nonpublic students by reinforcing the reading and writing strategies/activities of the regular classroom and/or providing theme-related materials whenever possible.

Instructional Expectations, as delineated in the *Policy Guide and Handbook for ESEA Chapter 1 Programs (Summer 1992),* stated that each teacher's program was to be structured so that a visitor should observe the following facets:

1. Learning Environment: Teacher had created a literature environment and a positive and purposeful classroom climate.

2. Support Materials: Teacher used support materials which revealed a well-organized and focused instructional program.

3. Instructional Expectations: Teacher had developed a well-organized and focused instructional program which incorporated reading and writing of whole text, rereading of familiar text, and other instructional activities to meet individual needs.

4. Required Documentation: Teacher adhered to Chapter 1 guidelines.

The facet, "Required Documentation: Teacher Adhered to Chapter 1 Guidelines," dealt with maintaining up-to-date student selection information on the selection printout and current selection test information; attendance records; posted class schedules and weekly schedules; records of ongoing coordination meetings; and parent involvement records. All of these records were used to monitor the program throughout the year by the Department of Program Evaluation and by the Federal and State Programs personnel. Monitoring of the other Instructional Expectations was assumed by Federal and State Programs instructional personnel. The second target of the goal was that teachers provide opportunities for parent involvement through conferences, group meetings, classroom visits and progress reports since

parent involvement was considered essential to the goal of helping students to become successful readers and learners at their grade levels. Records were kept for number of contacts between program teachers and parents. These data were reported to the appropriate monitoring personnel.

The Chapter 1 Reading Program was staffed by 166 (unduplicated count) public and nonpublic teachers serving in 172 program units in 125 schools. One general fund teacher and her school were included in this census. Of the 125 schools with program units, 113 were in public schools and 12 were in Chapter 1 eligible nonpublic schools. Of the 113 public schools, 85 were elementary and 28 were middle. The Nonpublic Project served grades 1-8. Of the 166 teachers in the total program, 109 were public elementary school teachers (including the one general fund teacher), 48 were public middle school teachers, and 9 were nonpublic school teachers. Since some teachers were assigned to two schools, the 166 teachers taught in a total of 172 program units. Of these, 111 program units were in public elementary schools (including the general fund program unit), 49 units were in public middle schools, and 12 program units were in the Nonpublic Project schools (grades 1-8).

Fifty-nine (an unduplicated count) of the 166 Chapter 1 Reading Program teachers were combination teachers, i.e., Combos. For this report, to be considered a Combo teacher, the teacher had to be assigned both reading and mathematics at the same school. For definition purposes, teaching mathematics at one school and reading at another site made the teacher a half-time reading or a half-time mathematics teacher (not a Combo). Combos served in both the reading program and in the mathematics program at the same school. Evaluation of the mathematics program is reported separately (Gibbons, 1994).

Chapter 1 public school program teachers (both elementary and middle school) were funded 90 percent by Chapter 1 funds and 10 percent by the district's general fund. They were called Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers. According to Federal and State Program guidelines for implementing the Chapter 1 Reading Program, the public elementary and middle school, full-time Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers were to provide instruction to a maximum of 36 pupils (half-time teachers 18 pupils) during the day, nine times during a two-week cycle, for a minimum of 40-60 minutes per day. This was the prevailing pattern of service; however, other patterns were in evidence (Patterns of Service Delivery are discussed later in this report beginning on page 3). Instruction took place in regular classrooms or in rooms equipped as language laboratories. One .6 FTE general-fund teacher was assigned one school in this project. The general fund program unit represented an expansion of the Chapter 1 program. All Chapter 1 guidelines for this program unit was in effect. The data for this teacher's unit were subsumed in the elementary school data for this report.

Chapter 1 Nonpublic Project teachers (elementary and middle school) were funded 100 per cent by Chapter 1 funds and provided instruction individually, or in groups of four or five, to pupils two-to-five times per week, for 45 minute periods. They provided service off church property in mobile classroom units. Because Nonpublic Project teachers were Columbus school employees and were part of the Chapter 1 Reading Program, they followed ESEA Chapter 1 guidelines.[1]

Pupils qualified for the program based on a Selection Score (Grade 1) or a Service Index Number (Grades 2-8). The Selection Score used in Grade 1 was based on the scores from two diagnostic reading and writing tests (Clay, 1979). The Service Index Number used in grades 2-8 was based on a Total Reading Score adjusted for the pupil's age-grade. Pupils were then selected for service based on greatest need according to rank-order.

The Chapter 1 Reading Program served a total of 5956 pupils. Of the 5956 total, 3864 pupils (grades 1-5) were served in the public elementary school projects, 1855 pupils were served in the public middle school project, and the Nonpublic Project schools served 237 pupils in grades 1-8.

A further breakdown of the pupil census showed that at the primary level (grades 1-3), a total of 2726 public and nonpublic school pupils received service. At the intermediate level (grades 4-5), a total of 1330

public and nonpublic school pupils received service; and at the middle school level, (grades 6-8) a total of 1900 public and nonpublic school pupils were served.

Evaluation Design

Desired Outcomes

Three Desired Outcomes (performance objectives) to be achieved by program pupils were delineated for the Chapter 1 Reading Program as follows:

Desired Outcome 1: At least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample (those pupils who had valid pretest and posttest measures, were English-speaking, and attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued) will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. Percentages of pupils in grades 2-8 who gained at least 3.0 NCE in Reading Comprehension are reported in the findings section.

Norm-referenced test data for Reading Comprehension performance are reported for the grade 2-8 sample as required in Desired Outcome 1. In addition, Federal and State Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading for individual buildings. The criterion performance level for the Federal and State Guidelines is an aggregate gain of at least 1.0 NCE in both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading at the building level. The overall aggregate NCE score for grades 2-8 are reported in the findings section of this report. Aggregate scores at the building level are available on request.

Desired Outcome 2: Annually at least 75 percent of the pupils (grades 1-8) in the treatment group (those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued) will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level at the elementary level or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs at the middle school level. At the middle school level only pupils who are enrolled in a reading course will be included.

Desired Outcome 3: Of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group, at least 50 percent of the pupils will read at least five books at text reading level 8 or above as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. At least 50 percent of the pupils in grade 2 and above in the treatment group who were not discontinued will independently read a minimum of ten books selected by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Program Timelines and Patterns of Service Delivery

Because all three Desired Outcomes defined the evaluation sample or the treatment group in terms of pupils who satisfied attendance requirements for the instructional period, the reader should be aware of the program timelines and the program teacher Patterns of Service Delivery in the Chapter 1 Reading Program.

For evaluation purposes, the program time period for Desired Outcome 1 and for aggregate test scores required by Federal and State Guidelines was 118 days maximum beginning September 21, 1992, and ending March 26, 1993, for all grades and all projects. Analyses of pretest-posttest performance was contingent upon the pupils' meeting the attendance criterion for inclusion in the evaluation sample for this outcome.

For pupils in grades 1-8, the program time period established for evaluating Desired Outcomes 2 and 3 was 142 days maximum beginning September 21, 1992 and ending May 7, 1993. Analyses of these two

outcomes were contingent upon pupils' meeting the attendance criterion delineated by the specific Desired Outcome.

The program timelines were in effect for all pupils except for those who were discontinued. To discontinue a pupil, the program teacher had to follow criteria set forth by Federal and State Programs. Any child discontinued following due process was automatically included in both treatment groups (regardless of their attendance).

However, there were some variations in the maximum number of program days (amounting to a day or two more or less) for the nonpublic schools. This difference occurred when their schedules differed from the Columbus Public School scheduled vacation days, inservice days, parent conference days, and professional days.

Public school Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers were funded 90 percent from Chapter 1 funds and 10 percent from the district's General Fund. Nonpublic Project teachers were funded 100 percent from Chapter 1 funds. General Fund time was not used for Chapter 1 pupils. Because of this, the maximum number of scheduled days (enrollment) for pupils was dependent upon each teacher's Pattern of Service Delivery. Even though the program guidelines defined the program time period giving the maximum number of possible school session days, each teacher's pattern of service dictated how many days would be counted as scheduled days for pupils in that unit.

There were four patterns of service delivery in effect. The general operating rule for public school program teachers was for them to schedule 90% of the pupil week or day for compensatory instruction. This was accomplished in several ways:

- Of the 172 program units, 61.6% (106 units) had pupils scheduled 90% of <u>each cycle of two weeks</u> for compensatory instruction, giving a 9 out of 10 day service pattern for each pupil.

- Of the 172 program units, 36.0% (62 units) had pupils scheduled 90% of <u>each day</u> for compensatory instruction, giving a 5-day service pattern for each pupil.

- Of the 172 program units, 1.2% (2 units) had pupils scheduled for 60% of each week (equivalent to 3 days a week) and another 1.2% (2 units) had pupils scheduled for 40% of each week (equivalent to 2 days a week). These two service patterns reflect the fact that some teachers had assignments in two schools or in two programs, with their total Chapter 1 time distributed in two classroom units.

Variations in service patterns created some complications during data analyses because inclusion in the evaluation sample or treatment group of any desired outcome was tied to an attendance criterion of pupil attendance for 80 percent of the scheduled days of instruction. Data analyses incorporated these mixed patterns so that pupils were not kept out of the treatment group or the evaluation sample.

<u>Instruments</u>

The evaluation design required the collection of data in five areas of operation for the overall program: Pupil Census; Standardized Achievement Testing; Retainee/Course Failure; Number of Books Read; and Parent Involvement. Though not required for the evaluation design, data from selected inservice meetings and process evaluation were collected, analyzed, and reported to Federal and State Programs. Specific instruments are discussed below. Copies of instruments used to collect the data are found in Appendix B, with the exception of the standardized achievement tests and some variations of the inservice evaluation form. Inservice evaluation forms were adapted to fit specific inservices, two examples of which are found in Appendix B.

1. Pupil Census Instruments

Calendar Worksheet for Recording Days of Pupil Attendance. The Calendar Worksheet was locally developed to help program teachers collect program scheduled/service data. A Calendar Worksheet was kept for each pupil. The form included the following information: the pupil's name, birthdate, number, ethnic or race code, sex, grade level, and the Selection Score/Service Index Number. These forms were kept up-to-date by the program teachers so that correct information was available to report at the end of the year on the Pupil Data Sheet. These forms were examined periodically for process evaluation. See page 32 of Appendix B for copy of form.

Pupil Roster 1992-93. In February 1993, a computer-generated roster of pupils sorted by program, school, teacher's social security number, and student name within grade was sent to program teachers. Program teachers checked all names of pupils enrolled and served during the 1992-93 school year. If teachers taught in two or more compensatory programs, they completed a roster for each program (see page 33, Appendix B for a sample copy).

Pupil Data Sheet. The Pupil Data Sheet was developed to help program teachers summarize the pupil information from the Calendar Worksheets and parent information from the Parent Involvement Log at the end of year. This instrument was used to collect the following information: identification of pupils who were English-speaking; subjective ratings of pupil progress given by teachers; the number of hours of instruction per week; identification of pupils who were discontinued; data on whether a parent helped with homework or read to child or vice versa; an enumeration of five parent involvement activities; the number of books read; the number of days of service received; and lastly, the teacher's pattern of service. A copy of the instrument can be found on page 34 of Appendix B.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Instruments

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). First- and second-grade pupils were administered the *Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth edition (MAT6, 1985)*, which were published by the Psychological Corporation/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. This test series has two sets of norms (national and nonpublic) for fall and spring. Standardization was established between October 1 and 31 in 1984 for fall, and spring standardization was established between April 8 and May 15 in 1985. Special testing of grade 3 program pupils occurred April 26-May 5, 1993 as a posttest for grade 3 pupils who took the MAT6 in spring 1992 as their pretest as second-graders.

California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985). The *California Achievement Tests* (CAT, 1985) were administered to program pupils in grades 3-8 in Spring 1992. This test series, which is also published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established in the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985.

All testing was done on level using the Norm-Referenced Model for evaluation of the Chapter 1 Reading Program. A spring-to-spring testing cycle was used for grades 2-8. The form, subtest, and test levels used for each grade level are shown in Table 1.

The achievement tests were administered as follows: Pretests and posttests for grades 2-8 were administered as part of Districtwide Testing in Spring 1992 and Spring 1993. Pupils in grade 1 were also tested as part of Districtwide Testing in Spring 1993 in order to establish pretest scores for the 1993-94 school year. During Districtwide Testing, tests were administered by classroom teachers with program teachers serving as proctors. Program teachers in the nonpublic schools (serving grades 1-8) followed the same testing schedule but administered their own pretests and posttests.

Table 1

Table of Standardized Achievement Measures
for Chapter 1 Reading Program
1992-93

Program Component	Grade	Pretest				Posttest			
		Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)	Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)
		Spring 1992				Spring 1993			
		Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)							
Elementary School Reading (Grades 1-5)	1	---	--	--	---	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading[a]
	2	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading
	3	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P2	L	Total Reading
		California Achievement Tests, 1985 Edition (CAT)							
	3	---	--	--	---	CAT	13	E	Total Reading[b]
	4	CAT	13	E	Total Reading	CAT	14	E	Total Reading
	5	CAT	14	E	Total Reading	CAT	15	E	Total Reading
Middle School Reading (Grades 6-8)	6	CAT	15	E	Total Reading	CAT	16	E	Total Reading
	7	CAT	16	E	Total Reading	CAT	17	E	Total Reading
	8	CAT	17	E	Total Reading	CAT	18	E	Total Reading

Note. The MAT6 Total Reading score includes the Vocabulary, Word Recognition, and Reading Comprehension Subtests, and the CAT Total Reading Scores include the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests.

[a]The MAT6 Level PR, Form L was administered to grade 1 pupils as part of the Districtwide Testing activity. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1993-94 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 2.

[b]The CAT Level 13, Form E was administered to grade 3 pupils as part of the Districtwide Testing activity. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1993-94 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 4.

3. Retainee/Course Failure Instruments

District Retention File and District Grade Reporting File. At the end of the year, information regarding retention was obtained from the district retention file for public school elementary pupils in grades 1-5. The course failure information for middle school pupils was obtained from the district grade reporting file for public school pupils in grades 6-8. This information was needed to determine the percentage of pupils meeting the criterion of Desired Outcome 2.

Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form. A locally developed instrument, Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form, was designed to collect the Nonpublic Project (grades 1-8) retention/course failure data. This printout was a roster of pupil names with spaces for marking whether or not an elementary pupil was retained or for recording the final grade received by a middle school pupil in reading. The retainee/course failure information for nonpublic schools was collected by program teachers and reported (via telephone) to the Department of Program Evaluation. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix B, page 35.

4. Instruments for Recording Number of Books Read

Locally developed instruments (Pupil Independent Reading Record Sheets) were constructed to assist teachers in maintaining records and reporting data at the end of the year. However, these primary sources were not collected for auditing purposes by the Department of Program Evaluation. The reading record sheets were used by program teachers to maintain listings of books pupils had successfully completed. The final number of books read by each pupil was reported to the Department of Program Evaluation on the Pupil Data Sheet. (See page 34, Appendix B for a copy of the Pupil Data Sheet.)

5. Parent Involvement Instrument

Parent Involvement Log. The Parent Involvement Log was a locally developed instrument designed to assist teachers in keeping a record of the number of parent contacts. Teachers were asked to collect data for two activities which could occur at anytime during the year: whether the parent helped the child with homework and whether the parent read to the child or the child read to the parent. Teachers were also asked to record how many parents were involved in the following five activities: involvement in planning, attendance at group meetings, individual conferences, parental classroom visits, and home visits (see page 36, Appendix B).

Pupil Data Sheet. This instrument, described earlier, was used by teachers to help summarize data from their Parent Involvement Logs. A copy can be found in Appendix B, page 34.

As stated at the beginning of the Instruments section of this report, data for selected inservice meetings and process evaluation were collected, although not required by the evaluation design. Locally developed instruments were designed by Federal and State Programs in conjunction with the Department of Program Evaluation to obtain teacher perceptions regarding selected inservice sessions. The forms were administered to participants at the close of each formally evaluated inservice session. The inservice evaluation forms were usually adapted to fit specific inservices, but two representative examples of inservice evaluation forms can be found on pages 37-39, Appendix B. While the design did not provide for the collection of these data (nor are the findings reported here), interim inservice evaluation reports were forwarded to Federal and State Programs, where they are available on request. Dates and topics of the inservice meetings are shown in Table 2.

A discussion of the results from process evaluation, which was conducted periodically throughout the year, appears later in this report.

Table 2

Dates and Topics of Chapter 1 Inservice Meetings Conducted
for Public and Nonpublic Teachers in the
Chapter 1 Reading Program
1992-93

Date	Title of Inservice	Elementary (Grades 1-5)	Middle (Grades 6-8)	Nonpublic (Grades 1-8)
August 17-21, 1992	Consulting Teacher Summer Inservice (not formally evaluated)	X	X	
	Nonpublic Program Orientation			X
September 17, 1992	Early Reading/Writing Strategies for Grade 1	X		
October 15, 1992	Use of Instructional Handbook (NP, Grades 1 and 2)	X		X
December 7, 1992-December 16, 1992 (five sessions)	Instructional Planning and Focused Instruction	X		
January 6, 1993	Instructional Planning, Focused Instruction, and Strategies for Beginning Reading	X		
February 2, 1993	Instructional Reading Strategies, Writing Process, and Chapter 1 Issues		X	
February 18, 1993	One to One Instruction, Identification of Nontraditional Gifted Students, and Model Lesson Using the Writing Process for Classroom Teachers	X		X
February 23, 1993	Using Portfolios; Motivating Reluctant Readers/Writers; and Intervention Strategies that Work With Low Readers		X	

(continued)

Table 2 (cont.)

Dates and Topics of Chapter 1 Inservice Meetings Conducted
for Public and Nonpublic Teachers in the
Chapter 1 Reading Program
1992-93

Date	Title of Inservice	Elementary (Grades 1-5)	Middle (Grades 6-8)	Nonpublic (Grades 1-8)
March 9, 1993	Motivating Reluctant Readers/Writers; Identification of Nontraditional Gifted Students; and Writing as an Outgrowth of Reading		X	
March 11 and March 25, 1993	Working with Intermediate Chapter 1 Students; Helping Classroom Teachers Work with 4-5 Grade Students; Shared, Guided, and Collaborative Writing; Curriculum Compacting	X		X
March 19, 1993	Guidelines for Student Program Improvement			X
March 23-April 30, 1993 (seven sessions)	Guided Reading Part 2 and Observation of Chapter 1 Classroom	X		X
March 25, 1993	Intervention Strategies that Work with Low Readers and Using Young Adult Novels		X	
April 21, 1993	Conferencing with Students About Writing; Using Holt Materials Effectively; Using Results of Formative Tests to Guide Instruction	X		X
May 4, 1993	Observation of a Chapter 1 Classroom		X	
May 25, 1993	End-of-Year Wrap-up (not formally evaluated)			X
Total		9	6	8

Major Findings

Three Chapter 1 Reading Program projects served elementary (grades 1-5) and middle school pupils (grades 6-8) in the public schools and grades 1-8 in the nonpublic schools. The Nonpublic Project (NP) and the public school project achievement data were generally aggregated as a single entity for reporting purposes in the results section of this report. The same Desired Outcomes were expected from both public and nonpublic projects. An overview of evaluation results for the three Desired Outcomes is provided in Tables 10 and 11 on pages 23-24.

Pupil Census Information

A total of 5956 pupils, including 5719 pupils in public schools (grades 1-8) and 237 in nonpublic schools (grades 1-8), was served by the ESEA Chapter 1 Reading Program during the 1992-93 school year for an average of 3.4 hours of instruction per week. Of the 5956 public and nonpublic school pupils, 4056 were in grades 1 through 5 and 1900 pupils attended middle schools. Generally, the 237 nonpublic elementary and middle school pupils' enrollment and attendance data were subsumed in the public school data.

The average daily membership in the overall program was 4653.35 pupils. The average days scheduled (enrollment) per pupil was 103.4 days, and the average days served (attendance) per pupil was 84.5 days. Data pertaining to enrollment and attendance are presented in Table 3.

Pupil census information also included teachers' subjective ratings of pupil progress as pupils exited the program. Of the 5956 pupils served in the program 5955 were rated: 1668 (28.0%) were rated by their program teachers as making much progress, 3696 (62.1%) as making some progress, and 591 (9.9%) as making no progress.

Standardized Achievement Test Information

Program pupils were included in either or both of two evaluation samples. One was comprised of pupils who met the attendance criteria or were discontinued, were English speaking, and had a valid Reading Comprehension pretest and posttest score. The second was comprised of pupils who met the attendance criteria or were discontinued, were English-speaking, and had a valid Total Reading pretest and posttest score. Some pupils might have met the criteria for only one evaluation sample. Norm-referenced test data for Reading Comprehension are reported for grades 2-8 as required in Desired Outcome 1. In addition, Federal and State Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) and Total Reading (Basic Skills) for individual buildings. Therefore, Total Reading test data for grades 2-8 are also reported in the Federal and State Guidelines Information section.

Of the 5956 pupils served, 52 (0.9%) were non-English speaking and 279 (4.7%) were eligible for Special Education. An additional 3729 were excluded from the Reading Comprehension analysis due to incomplete test data and/or non-attainment of the attendance criterion. The final evaluation sample for the Reading Comprehension analysis was comprised of the remaining 1896 pupils, which was 31.8% of the pupils served. The final evaluation sample for the Total Reading analysis was 1871 pupils, or 31.4% of the pupils served. Excluded from the evaluation sample for Total Reading were the 52 non-English speaking pupils as well as the Special Education pupils and an additional 3754 pupils who had not attained the attendance criterion and/or had incomplete test data.

Normal curve equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. In the following narrative the Reading Comprehension (Advanced) test results from the grade 2-8 evaluation sample used to measure Desired Outcome 1 attainment are discussed first; and following that discussion,

Table 3

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Served; Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served, Daily Membership, and Hours of Instruction Per Week Reported by Grade Level for Chapter 1 Reading Programs
1992-93

Grade	N	Girls	Boys	Average			
				Days Scheduled[a]	Days Served[b]	Daily Membership[c]	Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
1	162	70	92	97.6	84.6	125.5	3.3
2	1411	603	808	97.1	83.9	1071.4	3.3
3	1153	488	665	101.7	87.5	913.7	3.3
4	692	311	381	101.1	85.1	546.8	3.3
5	638	297	341	98.7	81.5	490.9	3.3
6	715	330	385	111.6	87.0	563.8	3.5
7	725	342	383	114.8	89.6	587.3	3.5
8	460	209	251	108.8	82.3	354.0	3.5
Total	5956	2650	3306	103.4	85.4	4653.4	3.4

[a]Days scheduled included days the pupils were scheduled and NOT served as well as days pupils WERE served. Scheduled days for all pupils began September 21, 1992 and ended for all projects on May 7, 1993.

[b]Days served were days pupils actually received instruction.

[c]Average Daily Membership was dependent on the Pattern of Service Delivery used by individual teachers.

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
6.6.04

the Total Reading (Basic) test results from the grade 2-8 evaluation sample used in aggregated data to fulfill Federal and State Guideline requirements are discussed.

Desired Outcome 1 Information

Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in reading comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. The following section discusses the results of norm-referenced testing for Reading Comprehension for grades 2-8.

Evaluation of reading comprehension performance. The grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension included a total of 1896 public and nonpublic school pupils. Of the 1352 pupils in the elementary (grades 2-5 sample), 944 were in the primary groups and 408 were in the intermediate group. The middle school sample had a total of 544 pupils.

Data for normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for the 1896 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension are presented in Table 4. To meet the desired outcome for advanced skills, at least 50% of the pupils had to gain at least 3.0 NCE points between pretest and posttest. Of the 1896 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample, 1111 pupils, or 58.6% met this criterion change score. Thus Desired Outcome 1 was met for the overall program. The overall average gain for the program was 6.3 NCE points. Average NCE gains for individual grades are included in Table 4 and range from 0.5 NCE in grade 8 to 10.4 NCE in grade 2. Individual grades meeting the criterion of 50 percent of pupils in evaluation sample gaining at least 3.0 NCE points were grade 2 (67.3% of sample, average NCE gain 10.4); grade 4 (57.1% of sample, average NCE gain 4.8), grade 5 (77.2% of sample, average NCE gain 9.0); and grade 7 (65.3% of sample, average NCE gain 8.6). The desired outcome was not met at grade 3 (48.3% of sample, average NCE gain 3.7); grade 6 (47.8% of sample, average NCE gain 2.5); and at grade 8 (42.7% of sample, average NCE gain 0.5).

It should be kept in mind that NCEs are based on percentiles which compare the pupil's performance in relation to the general population. For a pupil's NCE score to remain the same at posttest as at pretest does not denote a lack of absolute progress; on the contrary, it means that the pupil has maintained the same relative position in terms of the general population. Even a small gain in NCEs indicates an advancement from the pupil's original level of achievement. For readers interested in percentile statistics for Reading Comprehension, see Table A-1 in Appendix A (page 29).

Federal and State Guidelines Information

Because Federal and State Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) and for Total Reading (Basic Skills) for individual buildings, Total Reading test data for grades 2-8 are reported in the following section as aggregated data.

Evaluation of total reading performance. A census of the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Total Reading indicated a total of 1871 public and nonpublic school pupils. Of the 1328 pupils in the elementary school (grades 2-5) evaluation sample, 921 were in the primary level and 407 were in the intermediate level. The middle school evaluation sample had a total of 543 pupils.

Overall results for normal curve equivalents for the 1871 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Total Reading are presented in Table 5. Aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available on request. For purposes of this report, only the average NCE scores for Total Reading by grade and total program are reported here. The overall average gain for the program was 4.9 NCE points. Positive changes occurred in all grades with average gains as follows: 8.2 NCEs in grade 5, 6.4 NCEs in grade 7,

Table 4

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) and Percent of Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a] for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Reading Comprehension Performance Reported by Grade Level 1992-93

Grade	Sample	Pretest				Posttest				NCE Change		
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Overall Average Change	Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a] N	Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a] %
2	486	1.0	81.1	22.2	14.9	1.0	99.0	32.6	17.1	10.4	327	67.3[b]
3	458	1.0	65.6	28.2	11.3	1.0	89.6	31.9	16.6	3.7	221	48.3
4	224	1.0	52.0	27.1	10.5	3.0	62.0	32.0	13.1	4.8	128	57.1[b]
5	184	3.0	52.0	25.9	10.6	9.0	77.0	34.9	11.4	9.0	142	77.2[b]
6	205	9.0	52.0	27.5	9.8	1.0	60.0	30.0	11.7	2.5	98	47.8
7	222	1.0	79.0	23.9	11.8	6.0	68.0	32.5	11.4	8.6	145	65.3[b]
8	117	6.0	46.0	29.2	9.9	1.0	52.0	29.7	10.6	0.5	50	42.7
Total	1896	1.0	81.1	25.8	12.2	1.0	99.0	32.1	14.6	6.3	1111	58.6[b]

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 in Spring 1991 and Spring 1992. Grades 3-8 received the CAT in Spring 1992 and in Spring 1993.

[a]Criterion: At least 50% of pupils in the evaluation sample to make a gain of 3.0 or more NCE points.

[b]Met Desired Outcome.

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
6.6.04

Table 5

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) and Overall Average NCE Change for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Total Reading Performance Reported by Grade Level 1992-93

		Pretest				Posttest				
Grade	Sample	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Overall Average NCE Change
2	480	1.0	74.7	22.2	14.4	1.0	81.1	28.1	16.3	5.9
3	441	1.0	67.7	23.7	10.9	1.0	99.0	27.9	15.9	4.3
4	223	1.0	70.0	24.4	10.4	1.0	63.0	29.5	12.3	5.1
5	184	1.0	43.0	24.5	8.5	1.0	75.0	32.7	11.2	8.2
6	205	1.0	46.0	26.3	7.8	1.0	62.0	27.5	10.9	1.2
7	222	1.0	39.0	22.4	9.0	1.0	68.0	28.8	12.1	6.4
8	116	1.0	39.0	24.5	8.1	2.0	52.0	26.3	9.9	1.8
Total	1871	1.0	74.7	23.6	11.1	1.0	99.0	28.6	14.0	4.9

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 while grades 3-8 received CAT as pretest and posttest.

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
5.5.94

5.9 NCEs in grade 2, 5.1 NCEs in grade 4, 4.3 NCEs in grade 3, 1.8 NCEs in grade 8, and 1.2 NCEs in grade 6. For readers interested in percentile statistics, see Table A-2 in Appendix A (page 30).

Basic and advanced skills aggregated scores for Federal and State Guidelines. According to Federal and State Guidelines school buildings will be designated for School Program Improvement in two ways: (1) when any Desired Outcome for the program is not met at the building level, or (2) when the aggregate NCE change score for the building is less than 1.0 NCE in Advanced Skills (Reading Comprehension) and/or Basic Skills (Total Reading). Buildings in School Improvement are required to submit a plan to strengthen their program.

Aggregate scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Assistance, and are available on request. For purposes of this report, only summary data by grade are presented. Aggregate scores were reported earlier in this report for Reading Comprehension (Table 4) and Total Reading (Table 5).

Table 6 presents program pupil performance in Advanced Skills and Basic Skills dichotomized in relation to the state mandated criterion of 1.0 NCE gain. As indicated in Table 6, 1211 pupils (63.9%) made gains of 1.0 or more NCE points in Advanced Skills (Reading Comprehension) and 1162 pupils (62.1%) made gains of 1.0 or more NCE points in Basic Skills (Total Reading).

Desired Outcome 2 Information

Desired Outcome 2 stated that 75 percent of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their reading courses (grades 6-8). Information for the public school and NP Chapter 1 Reading Program was collected at the end of the year. To determine the number and percent of public school pupils who were promoted to the next grade or who passed their reading courses, the district retention file for grade 1-5 pupils and the district grade reporting file for grade 6-8 pupils were used.

Information for the nonpublic school Chapter 1 Reading Program was collected from program teachers via telephone and recorded on the Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form, a locally developed instrument. Program teachers consulted with each pupil's classroom teacher at the end of the year to determine which pupils were not promoted to the next grade in elementary or failed to pass reading at the middle school level.

Retainee/course failure. Table 7 presents the Desired Outcome 2 results. Of the 1896 pupils in the treatment group, 1755 (92.6%) were promoted to the next grade or passed their reading courses. In the elementary grades the percent of pupils who were promoted to the next grade ranged from 83.3% in grade 1 to 97.2% in grade 4. In the middle school grades the percent of pupils who passed their reading courses ranged from 87.0% in grade 6 to 91.5% in grade 8. The criterion for measuring Desired Outcome 2 was that 75 percent of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade (elementary pupils) or pass their reading courses (middle school pupils). This criterion was exceeded at every grade level. Thus Desired Outcome 2 was attained.

Desired Outcome 3 Information

Desired Outcome 3 stated that of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group, at least 50 percent of the pupils will read at least five books at text reading level 8 or above as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. At least 50 percent of the pupils in grade 2 and above in the treatment group who were not discontinued will independently read a minimum of ten books selected by the Chapter 1 teacher.

Information was collected by a locally constructed instrument (Pupil Data Sheet) at the end of the year. Program teachers submitted summary information on the form. The results from the analysis for Desired

Table 6

Frequencies and Percents of Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) Change Score Categories in Basic Skills and Advanced Skills by Grade in Relation to the State Established Criteria for Program Improvement
1992-93

	NCE Improvement Change Categories									
	Basic Skills[a]					Advanced Skills[b]				
		Less than 1.0		1.0 or More			Less than 1.0		1.0 or More	
Grade	Sample	n	%	n	%	Sample	n	%	n	%
2	480	192	40.0	288	60.0	486	134	27.6	352	72.4
3	441	188	42.6	253	57.4	458	216	47.2	242	52.8
4	223	74	33.2	149	66.8	224	83	37.1	141	62.9
5	184	34	18.5	150	81.5	184	36	19.6	148	80.4
6	205	103	50.2	102	49.8	205	96	46.8	109	53.2
7	222	60	27.0	162	73.0	222	62	27.9	160	72.1
8	116	58	50.0	58	50.0	117	58	49.6	59	50.4
Total	1871	709	37.9	1162	62.1	1896	685	36.1	1211	63.9

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 while grades 3-8 received CAT in the pretest and posttest.
[a]Basic Skills = Total Reading Subtests
[b]Advanced Skills = Reading Comprehension Subtest

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
6.4.94

Table 7

Total Sample and Number and Percent of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Who Passed/Failed in Regard to Promotion to Next Grade (Grades 1-5) or Reading/Language Arts Course (Grades 6-8) 1992-93

		Total Group			
		Passed		Failed	
Grade	N	n	%	n	%
1	66	55	83.3	11	16.7
2	469	436	93.0	33	7.0
3	399	383	96.0	16	4.0
4	218	212	97.2	6	2.8
5	162	157	96.9	5	3.1
6	231	201	87.0	30	13.0
7	234	204	87.2	30	12.8
8	117	107	91.5	10	8.5
Total	1896	1755	92.6	141	7.4

29

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
6.4.94

Outcome 3 showed that of 1909 pupils in the treatment group, 1557 (81.6%) of the pupils met the criterion of reading the requisite number of books for every grade level. See Table 8 for the results of the analysis by grade for Number of Books read.

Text reading level. To meet the criterion on number and level of books read for Desired Outcome 3, first-grade pupils had to read at least five books at or above text reading level 8. Of the 162 pupils served, 66 first-grade pupils were in the treatment group. Of the 66 pupils in the treatment group, 57 pupils (86.4%) successfully completed reading five books at or above text reading level 8 as certified by the Chapter 1 program teacher.

Independent reading. The task criterion for Desired Outcome 3 for Grade 2 and above involved pupils' reading independently a minimum of ten books which were selected by the Chapter 1 program teacher. Of the 5794 pupils served in grades 2-8, 1843 pupils were in the treatment group. Of the 1843 pupils in the treatment group, 1500 pupils (81.4%) successfully completed reading independently ten books selected by the Chapter 1 program teacher.

Tables 10 and 11 in the summary section of this report provide an overview of the results of the three Desired Outcomes that were to be achieved by program pupils in the Chapter 1 Reading Program.

Parent Involvement Information

Because parent involvement was considered essential to the goal of helping pupils become successful readers and learners at their grade levels, data were collected on this aspect of the program even though parent involvement was not included in the evaluation of desired outcomes. Teachers recorded parent involvement activities during the year on the Parent Involvement Log (Appendix B, page 36). The Pupil Data Sheet (Appendix B, page 34) was used to collect summary data from teachers at the end of the year concerning program activities involving parents of program children. Parent Involvement data were analyzed in two ways: the number of pupils whose parents had participated in parent involvement activities, and overall parent involvement in specific activities, reported for all pupils served during the year.

Overall parent involvement. Analysis results of overall parent involvement in five activities are presented in Table 9. Individual Conferences accounted for more parent involvement (5273 parents) than any other activity. Yearly totals for the other activities follow: group meeting with parents (1447 parents involved); parent classroom visits (1093 parents involved); planning, (638 parents involved); and visits to parent homes by teacher (127 visits). Since a parent could have involvement in more than one activity, an unduplicated count of parents was obtained from program teachers at the end of the year using the Pupil Data Sheet. This count indicated that for the 5956 pupils served, a total of 5779 parents of program pupils served were involved in one or more program involvement activities during the school year. Of the 5956 pupils served, 4609 (77.4%) had from one to four adult members of their families involved in the above five activities. In addition to the five activities noted above, teachers also kept a record of two other activities: 1) Parent helped with child's homework and 2) Parent read to child or vice versa. Of the 5956 pupils served, 5002 (84.0%) had parents who helped their children with homework and the parents of 4831 pupils (81.1%) parents read to their children or vice versa.

Process Evaluation Information

Two methods were used to collect process evaluation information: auditing of pupils' scheduled/served days and parent involvement records, and on-site visitations.

Audit. Teachers kept a Calendar Worksheet for each pupil to record scheduled/served days and other pupil information. On the reverse side of this instrument was the Parent Involvement Log which was used to record parent involvement information. Public school and nonpublic school teachers were asked to

Table 8

Total Sample and Number and Percent of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Who Read at Least Five Books At or Above Text Reading Level 8 (Grade 1) or Who Were Not Discontinued and Read at least Ten Books (Grades 2-8)
1992-93

Grade	Sample	Number of Books Read				Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a]	
		Total	Min.	Max.	Average	N	%
(Grades 2-8)		*Text Reading Level At or Above Level 8 (Grade 1)*					
1	66	406	0	11	6.2	57	86.4
		Independent Reading (Grades 2-8)					
2	462	6405	0	59	13.9	395	85.5
3	399	6200	2	95	15.4	347	87.0
4	218	2978	3	80	13.7	186	85.3
5	158	1966	0	60	12.4	129	81.6
6	235	2493	2	34	10.6	180	76.6
7	245	2483	2	25	10.1	170	69.4
8	126	1260	2	30	10.0	93	73.8
Subtotal (Grades 2-8)	1843	23785	0	95	12.9	1500	81.4
Total	1909	24191	0	95	12.7	1557	81.6

[a]The criterion for grade 1 was to read at least five books at or above Text Reading Level 8. The criterion for grades 2-8 was that pupils who were not discontinued would read at least ten books, as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher.

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
5-5-94

Table 9

Number of Parents and Total Number of Contacts Reported for Parent Involvement Activities for the Public and Nonpublic Schools in the Chapter 1 Reading Program
1992-93

Program Activities	Totals for Year: Treatment Group Pupils[a] (N=1941)	Totals for Year: All Pupils Served (N=5956)
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation and/or evaluation of your unit		
Number of Parents	203	638
Number of Contacts	577	1683
2. Group meetings for parents		
Number of Parents	697	1447
Number of Contacts	898	1794
3. Individual parent conferences		
Number of Parents	2024	5273
Number of Contacts	3678	9285
4. Parental classroom visits or field trips		
Number of Parents	480	1093
Number of Contacts	637	1392
5. Visits by teacher to parents' homes		
Number of Parents	50	127
Number of Contacts	59	158
Total Parents Contacted[b]	2212	5779
Total Number of Contacts	5849	14312

[a] Treatment Group Pupils are those who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or who were discontinued from the program.

[b] Total Parents Contacted is based on an unduplicated count of parents contacted, which is less than the sum obtained when combining the Number of Parents for Activities 1-5.

send a random sample of these records to their Program Evaluator in November 1992, and again in February 1993. After each teacher's records were reviewed, teachers were scheduled, as needed, for telephone conferences; problems were discussed and ameliorated.

On-site visitations. During December 1992 - January 1993, Program Evaluators conducted on-site school visitations to all program teachers to verify that the Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers and the Nonpublic Program teachers were using 1) appropriate pupil selection procedures 2) had an up-to-date list of books read for each pupil, 3) had a current class schedule posted, 4) had identified and completed the appropriate forms for a student in Student Program Improvement, and 5) had verifiable evidence of biweekly coordination with classroom teachers. To facilitate this evaluation activity, the city was divided into geographical areas. Within each geographical area all project teachers in the program were visited by a Program Evaluator--regardless of whether the project units were reading or mathematics, public or nonpublic.

Selection lists were reviewed. The pupils served, as well as the pupils on the waiting lists in each subject area, were ascertained. Overall, appropriate pupils were selected. When there were irregularities, the problems stemmed from scheduling conflicts or mobility at the middle school level or personal annotation systems other than the system advised by the Department of Program Evaluation at the elementary level.

Records of books being read were generally up-to-date but were in various stages of being transferred from a given teacher's personal records to a more formal one. Schedules were generally updated or in process of being updated by all teachers. Student Program Improvement students were all identified with the teachers' having written the students' instructional plans or in the process of completing them. Lastly, evidence of coordination of instruction was evident in almost every teacher's lesson plan book. At the elementary level it was astonishing to discover that teachers were coordinating with as many as 12 different classroom teachers. Coordination plans were more sketchy at the middle school level because of scheduling and lack of common time with classroom teachers, e.g. lunch, before school, after school, conference times, or because they were out of synchronization with the classroom teachers' study units.

Summary

The purpose of the Chapter 1 Reading Program was to provide assistance to selected underachieving pupils in grades one through eight in order that they might attain more fully their potential by improving their language and reading skills. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs, as determined by continued cooperation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Inservice sessions were provided for various subgroups of program teachers.

A total of 5956 pupils was served by the Chapter 1 Reading Program during the 1992-93 school year. Average daily membership in the overall program was 4653.35 The average days scheduled (enrolled) per pupil was 103.4, and the average days served (attended) per pupil was 85.4. The program was staffed with 166 teachers serving 113 public schools, and 12 nonpublic Chapter 1 eligible schools in 172 program units. Of the 5956 pupils served, 3864 pupils were served by 109 teachers in the elementary public school project, 1855 pupils were served by 48 teachers in the public middle school project, and 237 pupils were served by 9 teachers in the nonpublic school project.

Pretest/posttest analyses included two evaluation samples. Norm-referenced test results for Reading Comprehension were reported for grades 2-8 as required in Desired Outcome 1. In addition, Federal and State Guidelines required that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading for individual buildings. Consequently, Total Reading test data were also reported. Program pupils were included in either or both of the samples. Both evaluation samples

were comprised of pupils who met their project attendance criteria, were English-speaking, and had a Reading Comprehension and/or a Total Reading pretest and posttest score. Some pupils might have met the criteria for only one evaluation sample.

In regard to aggregate test results to meet Federal and State Guidelines, aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available upon request. For purposes of this report, only the grade and total program NCE scores were reported. The overall average NCE change for the program was 6.3 in Reading Comprehension and 4.9 in Total Reading. It should be kept in mind that these were aggregate scores for the district. Individual buildings were expected to show an aggregate gain of 1.0 NCE or more according to State Guidelines.

The program had three Desired Outcomes. Findings for these Desired Outcomes are summarized in Tables 10 and 11.

The criterion for performance for Desired Outcome 1 was that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the sample would gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension. Table 10 gives summary data for pupils in the evaluation sample, with the percent of pupils meeting the criterion for Desired Outcome 1. The number of pupils in the evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension shows that of the 1896 pupils in the evaluation sample, 1111 pupils (58.6%) met the criterion for Reading Comprehension.

Desired Outcome 2 stated that 75 percent of pupils in the treatment group would demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom by promotion to the next grade (grades 1-5) or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs (grades 6-8). The criterion was met in every project at every level with 1755 pupils (92.6%) of the 1896 pupils in the treatment group either being promoted or passing their courses. For results by grade see Table 11.

Desired Outcome 3 stated that of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group, at least 50 percent of the pupils will read at least five books at level 8 or above as certified by the Chapter 1 teacher. At least 50 percent of the pupils in grades 2 and above in the treatment group who were not discontinued, will independently read a minimum of ten books selected by the Chapter 1 teacher. In grade 1, there were 66 pupils in the treatment group. Of these pupils, 57 (86.4%) successfully read the appropriate level and number of books. In grade 2 and above, 1843 pupils were in the treatment group. Of these pupils 1500 (81.4%) independently read the minimum number of ten books. For results by grade see Table 11.

The results from the monitoring of parent involvement showed that parents of 77.4 percent of the pupils served participated in designated Chapter 1 Reading Program activities. Teachers reported contact with parents for specified activities. They reported an unduplicated total of 5779 parents of pupils served who were involved in one or more activities.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor the record-keeping procedures, classroom management, and classroom activities of teachers. Telephone conferences and on-site visitations were instrumental in assuring that program guidelines were being followed.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to strengthen the 1993-94 Chapter 1 Reading Program:

1. Since the program was highly successful in achieving each of its Desired Outcomes, it is strongly recommended that the program be continued.

Table 10

Total Number of Pupils in Evaluation Sample and Number and Percent of Pupils Meeting Criterion for Desired Outcome 1 for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program
1992-93

	Desired Outcome 1		
	Reading Comprehension		
		Outcome Achieved[a]	
Grade	N	n	%
2	486	327	67.3
3	458	221	48.3
4	224	128	57.1
5	184	142	77.2
6	205	98	47.8
7	222	145	65.3
8	117	50	42.7
Total	1896	1111	58.6

[a]The desired outcome for reading comprehension stated that at least 50% of pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample will make a gain of 3.0 or more NCE points.

P:\P502\FCT93TBL
6.4.04

Table 11

Total Number of Pupils in Treatment Groups and Number and Percent of Pupils Meeting Criteria for Desired Outcomes 2 and 3 for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program 1992-93

	Desired Outcome 2						Desired Outcome 3		
	Promotion to Next Grade (Elementary)			Pass Reading Course (Middle School)			Reading Books		
		Outcome Achieved[a]		Sample	Outcome Achieved[b]			Outcome Achieved[c]	
Grade	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%
1	66	55	83.3	--	--	--	66	57	86.4
2	469	436	93.0	--	--	--	462	395	85.5
3	399	383	96.0	--	--	--	399	347	87.0
4	218	212	97.2	--	--	--	218	186	85.3
5	162	157	96.9	--	--	--	158	129	81.6
6	--	--	--	231	201	87.0	235	180	76.6
7	--	--	--	234	204	87.2	245	170	69.4
8	--	--	--	117	107	91.5	126	93	73.8
Total	1314	1243	94.6	582	512	88.0	1909	1557	81.6

[a]The desired outcome for elementary pupils stated that at least 75% of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade. [b]The desired outcome for middle school pupils stated that at least 75% of the pupils in the treatment group would pass the course in which reading instruction occurred. [c]The desired outcome for Pupils Reading Books stated that at least 50% of the pupils would read the appropriate number of books for their grade level (at least five books at text reading level 8 or above for grade 1, or at least ten books for grades 2-8).

39

2. Of the 5956 pupils served in grades 1-8, only 1941 (32.6%) met criterion to be included in any treatment group, i.e. attended 80 percent of time. Ways to improve attendance need to be studied.

3. Federal and State Program personnel should continue to provide supervision through inservice and school visitations to maintain the feeling among program teachers of having a strong support system.

4. The Department of Program Evaluation should continue monitoring of record keeping and data collection. This has been helpful in assuring the validity of data collected.

5. Administrators and staff should develop a plan to insure that joint planning with program teachers is occurring. Teacher schedules and locations in a building have sometimes acted as constraints to more frequent and formal joint planning particularly at the middle school level.

References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters. (1985). California achievement tests. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Clay, M.M. (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties: A diagnostic survey and reading recovery procedures. Aukland, New Zealand: Heinemann Publishers.

ESEA Chapter 1 FY-93 program application (1992). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Federal and State Programs.

Policy guide and handbook for ESEA Chapter 1 programs. (Summer 1992). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Federal and State Programs.

Gibbons, M. (1994). Mathematics development component: Chapter 1 mathematics program, 1992-93. Final Evaluation Report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore, R. and Chamberlain, E. (1991). Language development component: Compensatory language experiences and reading (CLEAR), 1989-90. Final evaluation report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore, R. and Chamberlain, E. (1992). Language development component: Chapter 1 reading program, 1990-91 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1, Final Evaluation Report). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore R. and Chamberlain, E. (1993). Language development component: Chapter 1 reading program, 1991-92 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1, Final Evaluation Report). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Prescott, G. A., Balow, I. H., Hogan, T. P. and Farr, R. C. (1985). Metropolitan achievement tests, sixth edition. Chicago, Illinois: The Psychological Corporation.

Footnote

[1]One nonpublic school differed from other nonpublic schools served by the program in that (1) it was not a church-operated school, and (2) it served only pupils with learning disabilities and/or behavior disorders. Because it was not a church-operated school, program instruction was provided in the school building instead of in a mobile classroom unit. Also, there were no norm-referenced pretest data from the previous year because of the students' eligibility for special education. Therefore norm-referenced test data from this school were not included in the overall findings.

Appendix A

Additional Tables

Table A-1

Minimum, Maximum, and Median Score of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Reading Comprehension Performance Reported by Grade Level 1992-93

		Pretest			Posttest		
Grade	Sample	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile
2	486	1	93	8.0	1	99	17.0
3	458	1	77	13.0	1	97	18.0
4	224	1	54	14.0	1	71	21.0
5	184	1	53	14.0	3	90	24.0
6	205	3	54	16.0	1	68	19.0
7	222	1	91	12.5	2	80	21.0
8	117	2	42	20.0	1	54	18.0

Table A-2

Minimum, Maximum, and Median Score of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Total Reading Performance Reported by Grade Level 1992-93

Grade	Sample	Pretest			Posttest		
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile
2	480	1	88	7.0	1	93	14.0
3	441	1	80	10.0	1	99	15.0
4	223	1	82	12.0	1	73	16.0
5	184	1	36	12.0	1	88	21.0
6	205	1	43	13.0	1	71	16.0
7	222	1	30	11.0	1	80	17.0
8	116	1	30	12.0	1	54	14.0

Appendix B

Instruments

CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE
Chapter 1 Reading Program (Grades 2-8)
1993-94

Student Legal Name _____ (Last, First)

Student Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _ (M M D D Y Y)

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code ____ (1-5) Sex _____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level _ _

Service Index Number _ _ . _

Program Teacher Name _____

Program Code _ _ _ _ _

School _____

School Code _ _ _

1993-94	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	SUB-TOTALS Scheduled (1,2)	SUB-TOTALS Served (2)
Aug. 30 - Sept. 24	M	M	1	2	3	H	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17	20	21	22	23	24		
(Max. schdl. days=05)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Sept. 27 - Oct. 22	27	28	29	30	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	CBTA	18	19	20	21	22		
(Max. schdl. days=19)															0							
Oct. 25 - Nov. 19	25	26	27	28	29	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	PC		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Nov. 22 - Dec. 17	22	23	24	H	N	29	30	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17		
(Max. schdl. days=18)				0	0																	
Jan. 3 - Jan. 28	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14	H	18	19	20	21	24	25	26	27	28		
(Max. schdl. days=19)											0											
Jan. 31 - Feb. 25	31	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	PC	22	23	24	25		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																0						
Feb. 28 - Mar. 25	28	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	21	22	23	24	25		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 28 - Apr. 22	28	29	30	31	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	22		
(Max. schdl. days=14)					0	0	0	0	0	0												
Apr. 25 - May 20	25	26	27	28	29	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20		
(Max. schdl. days=10)											0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
May 23 - June 10	23	24	25	26	27	H	31	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	R	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////////	//////////
(No scheduled days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\

TOTALS Scheduled			Served		

(Maximum Scheduled = 143)
(Maximum Served = 143)

SERVICE CODES:

0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, General Fund Service, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class: Field Trips, Assemblies, Time Out, Testing, etc.)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil Scheduled and Present)

RACE/ETHNIC CODES:

1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

ALPHABETIC CODES:

(Write codes to LEFT of Date – Not in Service Code Fields)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn
D = Discontinued

P:\P502\CTCW94

INSTRUCTIONS: Put the letter X on the line to the left of the name of any pupil you served any time this year in this program. Add pupils as necessary.

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

PUPIL ROSTER 1992-93
SORTED BY NAME WITHIN GRADE

PREPARED BY
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION
(pif rstr9325)

16:03 Thursday, February 25, 1993

PROGRAM=93004 READING ELEM CH 1 SCHOOL=432 FAIRWOOD ES SSN=[redacted] TEACHER=[redacted]

SERVED (X)	LAST	FIRST	MI	STUDENT NUMBER	GR	BIRTH DATE	RACE	SEX
-	[redacted]	[redacted]	S	[redacted]	02	0 0	2	F
-			N		02	0 0	2	F
-			W		02	0 0	1	M
-			S		02	0 0	2	F
-			L		02	0 0	2	M
-			A		02	0 0	2	F
-			E		02	0 0	2	M
-			C		02	0 0	2	F
-			A		02	0 0	2	M
-			R		02	0 0	4	M
-			N		02	0 0	2	F
-					02	0 0	4	F
-			W		02	0 0	2	M
-			A		02	0 0	2	M
-			D		02	0 0	2	F
-			M		02	0 0	2	F
-			O		02	0 0	2	M
-			M		02	0 0	2	F
-			T		02	0 0	2	M
-					02	0 0	2	M
-			W		02	0 0	5	M
-			N		02	0 0	2	F
-			L		02	0 0	2	M
-			L		02	0 0	2	F
-			D		02	0 0	2	M
-			I		02	0 0	2	M
-			R		02	0 0	1	M
-			L		02	0 0	2	M
-			L		02	0 0	2	F
-			S		02	0 0	2	F
-			M		02	0 0	2	F
-			A		02	0 0	1	M
-			M		02	0 0	2	F
-			A		02	0 0	2	M
-			R		02	0 0	2	M
-			N		02	0 0	2	F
-			A		02	0 0	3	M
-			V		02	0 0	2	F
-			D		02	0 0	2	M
-			C		02	0 0	2	M
-			M		02	0 0	2	F
-			A		02	0 0	2	M
-			J		02	0 0	2	M
-					02	0 0	4	M
-			A		02	0 0	1	M
-			T		02	0 0	2	M
-			C		02	0 0	2	M

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SHEET

PUPIL DATA SHEET

46 SCHOOL CODE _ _ _ PROGRAM CODE 9 3 0 1 4 SSN _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

SCHOOL NAME _____ PROGRAM NAME _____ TEACHER NAME _____

1. STUDENT NAME _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ / _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ / _
   Last First MI

2. STUDENT NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ GRADE _ _ BIRTHDATE _ _ / _ _ / _ _

3. AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION | | | | | | |

4. PUPIL PROGRESS — NONE SOME MUCH

5. IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING? — NO YES

6. WAS THIS PUPIL DISCONTINUED? (CAREFULLY READ GUIDELINES) — NO YES

7. PARENT HELPED WITH HOMEWORK? — NO YES

8. PARENT READS TO CHILD OR CHILD READS TO PARENT? — NO YES

FOR NUMBERS 9-13, FILL IN THE NUMBER OF THIS PUPIL'S PARENTS INVOLVED IN EACH ACTIVITY DURING THE YEAR AND TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACTS.

	NO. OF PARENTS	TOTAL NO. OF CONTACTS
9. PLANNING		
10. GROUP MEETINGS		
11. INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES		
12. CLASSROOM VISITS		
13. HOME VISITS		

	THRU 03-26-93	FROM 03-29-93 THRU 05-07-93
14. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)		
15. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)		

16. WHILE IN YOUR CLASS, the Number of Selected Books Read | | | | |

17. ON AVERAGE, THIS PUPIL WAS SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE SERVICE _____ DAYS OUT OF _____.

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation (pif pds)

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

REVISED END OF YEAR DATA COLLECTION FORM
1992-93

PROGRAM 93104 SCHOOL 754 NOTRE DAME TEACHER [redacted]

LAST	FIRST	MI	STUDENT NUMBER	GRADE	DATE OF BIRTH	RACE	SEX	PROMOTE VALUE (P/F)	FINAL GRADE
[redacted]				01	05-30-86	2	M		
				01	07-26-85	1	M		
				01	08-19-86	1	M		
				01	05-27-86	1	M		
				01	02-08-86	1	F		
				01	11-11-85	1	F		
				01	02-16-86	1	M		
				02	01-16-84	1	M		
				02	11-26-85	1	F		
				02	12-31-85	1	F		
				02	06-23-84	1	M		
				02	09-27-85	1	F		
				03	07-28-83	1	M		
				03	04-28-83	2	F		
				03	04-28-84	2	F		
				03	04-01-84	1	F		
				03	03-30-83	1	M		
				03	08-06-84	1	M		

1 If pupil was not served this year, circle the student number

2 Enter actual grade in Final Grade column

3 If data is unavailable after call is made, enter a check mark to indicate that caller asked for data.

(pif npeoyfrm)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESEA - Chapter 1
Parent Involvement Log
1992-93

Program Code _____ Name of Pupil _____ Grade _____

Parent Name _____ Address _____ Phone Number _____

THE COLLECTION OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA IS REQUIRED BY CHAPTER 1.

Please check if the following two activities occurred for this pupil anytime this year.

☐ Parent helped child with homework
☐ Parent read to child or child read to parent

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate in the fields below the date, activity, name of parent/guardian, ~~and the time (Hours) you spent with the parent(s). ROUND HOURS TO THE NEAREST TENTH.~~ Obviously, you may keep expanded notes about activities somewhere else.

Date MMDDYY	Activity* (1-5)	Attendee(s) Parent/Guardian	~~Hours 00.0~~

*Kinds of Parent Involvement to record for the column labeled Activity

(1) Involved in planning (do not include advisory council)
(2) Group meetings (do not include advisory council)
(3) Individual conferences (telephone conferences included)
(4) Parental classroom visits
(5) Home visits

Revised 02/18/93

P:\P502\FRPTRD93
6-1-94 6-1-94

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1992-93

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/_____/_____ (e.g., 03/05/93)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____all day _____a.m. _____p.m. _____after school

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) Reading Elementary (1-5)
(2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(5) N or D (1-12)
(6) Nonpublic (1-8)
(7) Reading Recovery (1)
(8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(9) Instructional Assistant - K
(10) ADK
(11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
(12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
(13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

P:\P502\FRPTRD93
6-1-94 6-1-94

ESEA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1992-93 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting _____A.M.____P.M.____ALL DAY____

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) Reading Elementary (1-5)
(2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(5) N or D (1-12)
(6) Nonpublic (1-8)
(7) Reading Recovery (1)
(8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(9) Instructional Assistant - K
(10) ADK
(11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
(12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
(13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

		Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5.	Program Coordinators' Presentation					
	a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
	b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
	c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Evaluation Presentation					
	a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
	b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
	c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

Please turn over for questions 7-9

P:\P502\FRPTRD93
6-1-94 6-1-94

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____